

Group IV: Claims 37, 38

In reply to the requirement and in order to complete the written record of the case, applicants hereby elect Claims 23-30, 33 and 34 of Group I for examination with traverse.

Restriction has also been required in the form of an election of species. In reply to the requirement, applicants hereby elect Claims 23 and 24 with traverse.

Applicants traverse the requirement on the basis that the different claimed embodiments of the invention are, in fact, related inventions, because they rely upon the same alcoholic fluoroalkyl-functional group containing organosiloxane based composition. Thus, there is no clear distinction between designated invention categories. Further, it does not appear that an undue search burden would be placed on the Examiner to consider the claimed invention in all of its embodiments, because, for instance, only three separate subclasses of prior art would have to be searched in order to complete the search of invention categories I, II and IV. Further, the search of only two more subclasses would be necessary to complete a search of Group III, and thereby provide a complete search of all designated invention types.

As to the non-elected species clearly, since all non-elected embodiments are in the same group identification as the elected species, the search in only one and the same subclass of the prior art would be necessary to complete the search of all indicated species. Thus, no undue search burden would be placed on the Examiner to consider all of the elected species. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is therefore respectfully requested.

It is now believed that the application is in proper condition for consideration on its merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 24,618



22850

TEL: 703-413-3000
FAX: 703-413-2220

Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 27,013